

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

---

**MALIBU MEDIA, LLC**

**Plaintiff,**

**vs.**

**JOHN DOES 1-23,**

**Defendants.**

---

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:12-cv-04442

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 3rd day of April, 2013, upon consideration of Defendant John Doe #4's Motion to Quash Subpoena (Dkt. No. 9) filed on December 3, 2012, Plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition (Dkt. No. 17) filed on December 17, 2012, Defendant John Doe #9's Motion to Quash Subpoena Served on Comcast and/or Issue a Protective Order (Dkt. No. 16) filed on December 14, 2012, Defendant John Doe #9's Brief in Support of Motion (Dkt. No. 23) filed on December 26, 2012, Plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition (Dkt. No. 24) filed on December 28, 2012, Defendant John Doe # 15's Motion to Quash Subpoena (Dkt. No. 14) filed on December 10, 2012, Plaintiff's Memorandum in Opposition to Doe # 15's Motion to Quash (Dkt. No. 18) filed on December 19, 2012, and for the reasons set forth in the foregoing Memorandum,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motions are **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part<sup>1</sup> as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants' Motions to Quash Plaintiff's Subpoenas are denied, but Defendants' requests for a Protective Order are granted pursuant to the terms set forth in the attached Memorandum. This Order neither addresses the dispositive relief requested by John Doe Defendant #15 nor the Motion to Sever requested by John Doe Defendant #9. Pursuant to the Honorable James Knoll Gardner's Standing Order dated March 19, 2007, discovery disputes are to be resolved by the undersigned.

- (1) The Motions to Quash Plaintiff's Subpoenas filed by John Doe Defendants #4, #9, and #15 are **DENIED**; and
- (2) The requests for a Protective Order are **GRANTED** pursuant to the terms set forth in the foregoing Memorandum.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Henry S. Perkin  
HENRY S. PERKIN  
United States Magistrate Judge